

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 9-14 have been amended, and claims 15-22 have been newly added. The amendments have been drafted to overcome the indefiniteness rejections applied to claims 9-14. Support for the amendments is provided for example in paragraphs [0043] and [0046] of the published specification. The amendments were not presented earlier due to the unforeseeability of the remarks presented in the Final Rejection. (It should be noted that references herein to the specification and drawings are for illustrative purposes only and are not intended to limit the scope of the invention to the referenced embodiments.)

Claims 9, 10, 12, and 13 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Venkitaraman (US 2003/0185196) in view of Vivaldi ("Fast Handover Algorithm for Hierarchical Mobile IPv6 Macro-Mobility Management" article) and Valko (US 7,269,425). Claims 11 and 14 were rejected, under 35 USC §103(a), as being unpatentable over Venkitaraman in view of Vivaldi, Valko and Chubbs III (US 6,400,304). To the extent that these rejections may be deemed applicable to the amended claims, the Applicant respectfully traverses as follows.

Claim 9 now defines a communication system having a mobility anchor point that issues two care-of addresses to a communication terminal apparatus that communicates with access routers in cells adjacent across a boundary of a first mobility anchor point and a second mobility anchor point. The two care-of addresses comprise a first care-of address and a second care-of address that can be used in a predetermined number of cells and cannot be used in cells other

than the predetermined number of cells. The predetermined number of cells is less than the sum of the number of cells of the first and second mobility anchor points and includes two cells adjacent across the boundary. The claimed subject matter supports an advantage of reducing the work load for a network, managing a communication terminal apparatus at the boundary of two mobility anchor points, and reducing the communication delay of forwarding packets to the communication terminal as it transitions from one mobility anchor point to another (see paragraph [0017] of the published specification).

It is submitted that the applied references fail to disclose the subject matter now recited in claim 9 of a care-of address that can be used only in a predetermined number of cells, which include cells adjacent across the boundary of a first mobility anchor point and a second mobility anchor point.

Venkitaraman discloses a care-of address that can be used at only one mobility anchor point (see Venkitaraman Fig. 1 and paragraphs [0020] and [0026]).

In contrast, the Applicants' claimed first and second care-of addresses can each be used within two mobility anchor points.

Although Vivaldi may disclose two care-of addresses RCOA and LCOA, the RCOA is an address issued each time a terminal enters a new mobility anchor point domain (see Vivaldi page 631) and cannot be used in two cells adjacent across a boundary of a plurality of mobility anchor points. Vivaldi's LCOA is an address reissued for each change of access router (see page 631, right column), which has a narrower range than a mobility anchor point. Thus, it follows that Vivaldi's LCOA cannot be used in two cells adjacent across a boundary of mobility anchor points. Accordingly, Vivaldi's care-of addresses RCOA and LCOA do not correspond to the

Applicants' claimed first and second care-of addresses that can each be used within two mobility anchor points.

Because Venkitaraman and Vivaldi do not disclose the claimed subject matter of a care-of address that can be used in cells adjacent across the boundary of two mobility anchor points, it necessarily follows *per force* that Venkitaraman and Vivaldi cannot disclose that such care-of addresses can be used only in a predetermined number of cells, which number is less than the total number of cells in the two mobility anchor points.

Valko discloses allocating a globally routable address that is kept constant despite handovers (see Valko col. 1, lines 62-65). However, Valko's disclosed address is globally routable, whereas the Applicants' claimed care-of addresses can be used only in a predetermined number of cells, which number is less than the total number of cells in the two mobility anchor points.

Valko does not limit the use of an address, as does the Applicants' claimed subject matter. Due to this difference, Valko's system must manage addresses at all mobility anchor points and, therefore, creates an enormous processing load for managing the addresses. By contrast, the Applicants' claimed subject matter only needs to manage addresses in a predetermined number of cells and provides an advantage of minimizing a processing load for managing the addresses.

In summary, Venkitaraman, Vivaldi, and Valko, considered alone or together, do not teach or suggest the Applicants' claimed subject matter of care-of addresses that can be used only in a predetermined number of cells, which include cells adjacent across the boundary of two mobility anchor points and which number of cells is less than the total number of cells in the two mobility anchor points.

Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully submits that the teachings of Venkitaraman, Vivaldi and Valko, considered individually or in combination, do not render obvious the subject matter now defined by claim 9. Independent claim 12 similarly recites the above-mentioned subject matter distinguishing apparatus claim 9 from the applied references, but with respect to a method. Therefore, allowance of claims 9 and 12 is deemed to be warranted. The dependent claims are considered to be allowable due to their dependence from an allowable base claim and also due to their recitation of subject matter that provides an independent basis for their individual allowability.

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If any issues remain which may best be resolved through a telephone communication, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at the local Washington, D.C. telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

/James Edward Ledbetter/

Date: September 21, 2009
JEL/DWW/att

James E. Ledbetter
Registration No. 28,732

Attorney Docket No. 009289-05155
Dickinson Wright PLLC
1875 Eye Street, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20006
Telephone: (202) 659-6966
Facsimile: (202) 659-1559

DC 9289-5155 143242